

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

REMARKS

The application was filed with 54 claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-54. Applicant has amended claims 5, 29 and 30. Applicant has canceled claims 31 and 32. Thus, claims 1-30 and 33-54 are currently pending. Applicant requests that the pending claims be reconsidered.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Desai et al. Applicant has canceled claims 31 and 32. Applicant has amended claims 5, 29 and 30. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Support for the amendment is found at least on page 4 of the specification and elsewhere in the application, as originally filed, as described below. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2131, and case law therein, a claim is anticipated when each and every element of the claim is found in a single prior art reference. Desai et al. does not provide all of the limitations of the rejected claims, as further described below. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Desai's invention is best understood through its example of sharing address book or calendar information between two parties. The owner of the address book can select a specific 'data element' – such as name and phone number – and share it with other user, who can read the data and store it in his own storage, if so desired. They call this subset of data a profile or "view" of the user data.

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

It is possible to confuse Desai's use of the term "view" with Applicant's use of the term 'view or view page'. However, they are not same. In Applicant's application, it is a page or screen or an image of content that is being presented to the 'grantee' and it is composed by 'grantor' and it is not separate 'data elements' of Desai's application as if a subset of all available data that is given to the recipient. In short, it is an aggregated content page, or image, that is called a "view page" by Applicant.

In Applicant's application the user builds a picture or a "view page" and manages the building and sharing of that view page. The shared view becomes an 'actionable' entity where 'grantee' can not only "Read" the information but can also "act on it".

A major distinction from Desai is that they are sharing data and copying data from 'giver' to 'receiver'. There is no passing of controls or action from one to another. In Applicant's application, the data included in the view page are 'active' or 'actionable'. This means the 'grantee' can 'Read,' 'Refresh,' or have 'Full access' to the view's content. Here the grantee is not only able to read the information on the view page but can take action on that information using the view page itself. Grantee can Refresh the view page content where action goes via the grantee's server to source accounts and brings the new revised view as if the grantor was acting on the view content, or grantee can log in to the financial or other accounts and act as if grantee was the same person as grantor and take all the action such as pay bills, buy/sell stocks, review credit card transactions and so on. Desai does not address this capability of access emulation via an actionable shared view page.

Another important distinction between Desai and Applicant's invention is the process of sharing data. Desai's ZKEY approach with public/private key exchange is a complex access sharing technique in the field of computer data processing. However, Applicant does not use that

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US
 technique but provides a much more elegant and simple solution without any need for public/private key structure. Applicant provides a method of sharing view pages that is managed through information aggregation system data store using 'visitation access' management, where access rights are granted by grantor for each view page to each grantee and they do not need to be sharing any key structure. Each access to the information using their own access credentials thus there is no need to use public/private key structure.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to the limitation of "assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system." Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described in the preceding paragraphs. In order to reject this claim, Examiner relies upon Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 in Desai as well as their statement in abstract on 'selective real-time information sharing in a communication network' as basis for rejecting our first claim. Desai's 'information exchange system' "10" in above figure does not address the concept we are articulating. Fig. 9 and column 4 in Desai describe a way of creating 'view' and sharing of data; but that is different than what is articulated in Claim 1. The creation of 'view page' and storing of that 'view page' in the database and control of access right to that page are managed by the user. In Desai, the 'data elements' are stored in an Exchange System and users are granted permission to access or view that data. 'What is shared' and 'how sharing is managed' both differ from Desai. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn

Regarding Claim 2, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites Fig. 9 and Fig. 28 in Desai and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

performed as well as Column 9, lines 53-67. However, Fig. 9 is “a flow diagram illustrating the preferred steps for granting to an arbitrary group access to an arbitrary view” and Fig. 28 is “a diagram of the information view requests page.” Its associated description for Fig. 9 focuses on granting access to a group and managing public/private keys encryption for each shared data element for the group. The Fig. 28 description talks about alerting members to view access request. Cited Column 9 talks about ‘registered user receiving intelligent commerce recommendations’. The cited reference does not teach the additional limitation set forth in this claim. Further, since Claim 2 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 2 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 3, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. Examiner relies upon Fig. 9 and Fig. 42 and the associated descriptions in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed as well as the summary in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 3. However, the method of Desai’s Fig 9 and Fig 42 are very different from the invention as shown in Fig 14, Fig 15A, Fig 15B and Fig. 15C, as originally filed. While Desai relies on a public/private key method of access management with ZKEY, Applicant’s claimed invention does not require such key structure and makes it easy for grantee and grantor to share views using application database based settings. In Applicant’s approach, the grantee does not have to present any access key information to get access to grantor’s view, whereas Desai’s structure is based on ‘access code’ to be presented by recipient of the information. The shared information appears in grantee’s view without him doing anything to access it each time. Grantor sets up grantee to access a view and grantee gets access. This is a much simpler and different

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

method from that of Desai. Further, since Claim 3 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 3 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 4, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites Fig 1, Fig 5, and Fig 7 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed as well summary in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 4. Since Claim 4 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 4 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 5, Applicant has amended the claim. Support for the amendment is found on page 4, lines 24-26. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicant believes the amendment makes the rejection moot. Applicant notes that Desai uses public/private key structure with ZKEY while Applicant's invention is for grantor to create a page to view and grant access such that grantee does not have to take any action on his side to see the information or act on that view page. Applicant further notes that Desai's method of Fig. 25 focuses on their concept of view which is a cross section of selected data elements, i.e, a subset of all available data or a profile. Desai's meaning of "view" differs from that of Applicant. Desai does not have the concept of having an actionable view page that is created by grantor and that the access is set up for 'Read, Refresh or Full Access.' In Desai's depiction the focus is to grant access to data elements to be downloaded by grantee, whereas Applicant is sharing an image of information that is actionable at different levels. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

Regarding Claims 6-9, Applicant's believe the amendment of claim 5, the claim from which these claims depend, makes these rejections moot. Again, Applicant notes that Desai does not have 'actionable' page view where grantee can be limited to read the page or be allowed to take action to refresh the data or get full access to underlying websites as if the grantee was grantor. Since Claims 6-9 depend from amended claim 5, the rejections of these claims are not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 10, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites column 5, lines 57-65, as teaching the method of Claim 10. However, those lines in Desai read as follows: " After access has been granted, it can be denied on an element-by-element and person-by-person basis. First, the registered user selects one or more users and one or more data elements. For each user, the key chain database is searched for every record including the associated user ID and a universal ID of a selected data element. Each record, which includes the encrypted secret key generated by the registered user when access was first granted to the user is deleted."

Regarding Applicant's invention, in the preferred GUI of Fig. 14 the grantor is presented with a link 2300 for deleting or revoking access to a selected grantee. (i.e. revoking Visitation Access). As shown in Figure 15D, to revoke Visitation Access to a grantee, the grantor invokes the page for setting up visitation access 2312 (see Figure 14). A list of all the grantees to whom the grantor has granted visitation access and their respective access rights are displayed 2316. Selecting 2324 and deleting the grantee 2328 can revoke the rights of a grantee. If visitation rights are revoked in this manner and the grantor later wishes to restore access to the deleted grantee, the setup process must be repeated for the grantee by entering that particular grantee's Visitation Access Code (see 2216 in Figure 14). Alternately, revoking specific rights of that

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

grantee can temporarily revoke the visitation rights of grantee 2340. For example, if the grantee is not granted basic read access to the grantor's view, then he/she no longer has any visitation access to the information. If the grantor later wishes to re-assign the privileges to the grantee, those revoked permission can be activated again. The grantor can also revoke particular rights such as refresh or full-access for a particular grantee. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Further, since Claim 10 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 10 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 11, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 13, Fig. 25 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes summary of invention in columns 3, lines 49-62, as teaching the method of Claim 11. While Desai's method does talk about internet and other devices based on access to data by the user; Applicants' invention is different in that it addresses a 'view page' based sharing of information that is accessed by grantee using his own username and password without private/public ZKEY structure of Desai's invention. While Desai refers to registered user tagging specific data elements such as contact management or calendars and calls them a view, Applicant's definition of view is different. Also the grantee having access to plurality of view pages from one or more grantors along with his own pages to view, his ability to select different pages to view through access methods described here is not seen in Desai's approach. Further, since Claim 11 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 11 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

Regarding Claim 12, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites Fig. 3, Fig. 9, Fig. 25, Fig. 28, Fig. 42 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes summary of invention in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 12. In Desai's approach, view is a collection or subset of available data elements that are tagged by the registered user and a private/public key is associated with each element that registered user assigns and then 'separately encrypt the data element's secret key with each third party's public key to create an encrypted secret key for each third party'. In Applicants' approach, the grantor and grantee have their own access encryption/decryption keys that are unique to each other but not associated with an element or a view. When grantee wishes to access grantor's 'view page', if the permission is granted, the grantor's decryption key is used to get the 'view page' thus simplifying the whole process as opposed to the Desai's approach of tagging each element and creating keys for each element for each user. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Further, since Claim 12 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 12 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 13, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 9, Fig. 25, Fig. 28, Fig. 42 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes summary of invention in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 13. As explained above, the actionable 'Page View' and various different access rights are not addressed by Desai in above stated figures and text. Further, since Claim 13 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

Claim 13 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 14, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 9, Fig. 25, Fig. 28, Fig. 42 and associated description in the specification as providing the mechanism for performing the stated functionality, also notes summary of invention in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 14. As explained above, the actionable 'page view' and various different access rights are not addressed by Desai in above stated figures and text. Only Applicants' invention addresses the passing of actionable page to grantee and based on granted rights, allow granting to Read, Refresh or Full-Access the information on that page. The idea of updating data elements in Desai's profile to get more up to date phone number of calendar information is different from Applicant's invention as the update process is different and what is being updated is the data elements within a profile, but a profile is not the same as Applicant's 'view page'. Grantee does not perform on behalf of grantor updating the grantor's information itself, but is taking a new snap-shot of registered user's information that may be different than last time. For example, in Applicants' invention, grantee acts as grantor and updated grantor's view, while as Desai's user only reads again and again what registered user may have updated since last time. Also, the user has no ability in Desai's process to perform other actions though auto logon to grantor's destination web sites. Further, since Claim 14 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 14 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

Regarding Claims 15-18, since those claims depend from improperly rejected claims, the rejections of Claims 15-18 are not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 19, Applicant directs Examiner's attention to pages 24-26 of this Response. Therein is articulated the fundamental differences between Applicant's claim 19 and the cited reference. Again, Applicant believes the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes hardware infrastructure in column 11 teaching the method of this independent claim. One key factor to understand is that Applicants are addressing a unique way of sharing information for 'an account aggregation system'. The data elements and database content of Desai's is not the same as Applicant's 'view page' and its content derived from an account aggregation system. Applicant also notes that the hardware description of Column 11 in Desai is very specific to third party products (Netfinity 5000, Netfinity 7000 and nForce). Because the cited reference does not teach all limitations of the rejected claim, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 20-22, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claims. The Examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 9, Fig. 13, Fig. 25 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, as teaching these claims. The concept of Fig. 13 and Desai's idea on public and private information protection is through firewall and tagging each data element as public or private. Whereas in Applicants' invention, there is no role of firewall or hardware in the separation of public or private views. The grantor creates a view page as described in Applicant's

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

application and puts monitors, such as news or lifestyle information, in that view and such information that are not protected by personal access code are grouped together in a public view where as information such as bank account data is stored in a view that is considered a private view. The concept of travel advisor looking at user's calendar or profile data to help with travel plan in Desai with description in Column 9 and above figures, is different from Applicant's concept of an aggregated data view page sharing with an advisor, where both what is being shared and how it is shared are managed differently. Finally, since Claims 20-22 depend from improperly rejected claims, the rejection of Claims 20-22 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 23-25, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claims. The examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 9, Fig. 25 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes column 22 lines 1-22, as teaching the method of the claims. However, Desai's method of Fig. 1, Fig. 9 and Fig. 25 does not have the concept of having an actionable view page that is created by grantor and that the access is setup by grantor without grantee having to work with a private/public key, ZKEY complexity. Desai does not have 'actionable' page view where grantee can be limited to read the page or be allowed to take action to refresh the data or get full access to underlying websites as if the grantee was grantor. Applicants' method of setting up access rights is much simpler and unique than Desai's. Also, since Claims 23-25 depend from improperly rejected claims, the rejection of Claims 23-25 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 26, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. Regarding Applicant's invention, in the preferred GUI of Fig. 14 the grantor is

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

presented with a link 2300 for deleting or revoking access to a selected grantee. (i.e. revoking Visitation Access). As shown in Figure 15D, to revoke Visitation Access to a grantee, the grantor invokes the page for setting up visitation access 2312 (see Figure 14). A list of all the grantees to whom the grantor has granted visitation access and their respective access rights are displayed 2316. Selecting 2324 and deleting the grantee 2328 can revoke the rights of a grantee. If visitation rights are revoked in this manner and the grantor later wishes to restore access to the deleted grantee, the setup process must be repeated for the grantee by entering that particular grantee's Visitation Access Code (see 2216 in Figure 14). Alternately, revoking specific rights of that grantee can temporarily revoke the visitation rights of grantee 2340. For example, if the grantee is not granted basic read access to the grantor's view, then he/she no longer has any visitation access to the information. If the grantor later wishes to re-assign the privileges to the grantee, those revoked permission can be activated again. The grantor can also revoke particular rights such as refresh or full-access for a particular grantee. Applicants' method of revocation is different. Further, since Claim 26 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 26 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 27, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes hardware infrastructure section in Column 11, as teaching the method of Claim 27. The grantee having access to plurality of view pages from one or more grantors along with his own pages to view, his ability to select different pages to view through access methods described here is not seen in Desai's approach. Further, since Claim 27 depends from an

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US
improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 27 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 28, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 4, Fig. 5 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, also notes column 22, lines 1-22 as teaching the method of Claim 28. As explained above, the actionable 'Page View' and various different access rights are not addressed by Desai in above stated figures and text. Further, since Claim 28 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 28 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 29-30, Applicant has amended these claims to change the dependency. No new matter has been added. These amended claims still depend from improperly rejected claims. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 31-32, Applicant has canceled these claims making the rejections moot. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 33, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to the limitation of "assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system." Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 34, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to the limitation of "assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

aggregation system.” Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 35, Applicant draws Examiner’s attention to the limitation of “assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system.” Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 36, since that claim depends from an improperly rejected claim, the rejection of Claim 36 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 37, Applicant draws Examiner’s attention to the limitation of “assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system.” Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 38, the Examiner relies upon column 22, lines 1-22 and Fig. 25 as teaching the method of Claim 38. The additional limitation provided by claim 38 is not taught by the cited reference. Further, since Claim 38 depends from an improperly rejected independent

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

claim, the rejection of Claim 38 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 39, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The Examiner relies upon Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 5, Fig. 9, Fig. 25, Fig. 28, Fig. 42 and associated description in the specification as providing the mechanism for performing the stated functionality, also notes summary of invention in columns 3-6 and column 22, lines 1-22, as teaching the method of Claim 39. As explained above, the actionable 'page view' and various different access rights are not addressed by Desai in above stated figures and text. Only Applicants' invention addresses the passing of actionable page to grantee and based on granted rights, allow granting to Read, Refresh or Full-Access the information on that page. The idea of updating data elements in Desai's profile to get more up to date phone number of calendar information is different from Applicant's invention as the update process is different and what is being updated is the data elements within a profile, but a profile is not the same as Applicant's 'view page'. Grantee does not perform on behalf of grantor updating the grantor's information itself, but is taking a new snap-shot of registered user's information that may be different than last time. For example, in Applicants' invention, grantee acts as grantor and updated grantor's view, while as Desai's user only reads again and again what registered user may have updated since last time. Also, the user has no ability in Desai's process to perform other actions though auto logon to grantor's destination web sites. Further, since Claim 39 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 39 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

Regarding Claim 40, since that claim depends from an improperly rejected claim, the rejection of Claim 40 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 41, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to the limitation of "assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system." Further description of the visitation access code is provided on pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 42, since that claim depends from an improperly rejected claim, the rejection of Claim 42 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 43, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 5, Fig. 9, Fig. 25, Fig. 28, Fig. 42 and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, and notes in Columns 3-6, Column 22 lines 1-22, and Column 16, as teaching this independent Claim 43. Fig. 42 of Desai has a reference to a message but the message in this diagram is just telling the user that they have been granted an access to a view of registered user's data. In Applicant's application, the content of message itself is the secured information that is available like the 'page view' and shared between 'grantor' and 'grantee' for secure communication. Further, Applicant draws Examiner's attention to the limitation of "assigning a unique visitation access code to each of a plurality of grantee users of the Internet Information aggregation system." Further description of the visitation access code is provided on

Att. Dkt. No. A01210US
 pages 45-46 of the application, as originally filed. This limitation describes the actionable shared view page described throughout this document. The cited reference does not teach all limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 44, since that claim depends from an improperly rejected claim, the rejection of Claim 44 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 45 and 46, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claims. The examiner cites the Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, and notes from Column 16, as teaching the method of Claims 45 and 46. Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 describe a centralized data exchange system and Column 16 addresses decentralized access to secure data elements. In Applicant's method, the message is 'transmitted' without leaving the system which is unique. Further, since Claims 45 and 46 depend from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of those claims is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 47, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, and notes from Column 16, as teaching the method of Claim 47. The decryption of information for recipient in Desai is based on public/private key per data element per user where as in Applicant's method, there is no sharing of keys but it is managed with access rights. Further, since Claim 47 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US

47 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 48, the examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 3, as teaching the method of Claim 48. While Desai describes deleting a data element or view, the above figures do not show a 'delete' function. More over, Applicant's claim is directed toward deleting secure messages. Further, since Claim 48 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 48 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 49, since that claim depends from an improperly rejected claim, the rejection of Claim 49 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 50, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, and notes from Column 16, as teaching the method of Claim 50. In Applicant's application, the content of message itself is the secured information that is available like the 'page view' and shared between 'grantor' and 'grantee' for secure communication. The message is 'transmitted' and 'received' without leaving the system, which is unique. Further, since Claim 50 depends from an improperly rejected independent claim, the rejection of Claim 50 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 51-54, the cited reference does not teach all claim limitations of the rejected claim. The examiner cites Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and associated description in the specification as providing the description and depiction of how the stated functionality is performed, and notes

Atty. Dkt. No. A01210US
from Column 16, as teaching the methods of Claims 51-54. As the 'view page' is created and access is granted to the grantee, the secure message is also possible to share the same way. The message is 'transmitted' without leaving the system. Just as grantee selects a view page from all available view page from his own access point, he can access both real time and stored secure messages. Further, since Claims 51-54 depend from improperly rejected claims, the rejection of Claims 51-54 is not proper. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant has merely commented upon certain aspects of the invention and reserve the right to provide further comments as necessary. Applicant notes that these remarks should not create limitations to the claims and that the claim language itself should be considered.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 22, 2006

WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP
Suite 800
1715 Aaron Brenner Drive
Memphis, TN 38120-4367
Phone: 901-537-1049
Fax: 901-537-1010

By Doug Schelling

Douglas W. Schelling, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 48,335

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or any future papers, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No 502346 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.